

### Remarks

Claims 1 and 11 are cancelled and claim 17 is added. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 12 and 16 are amended. Claims 2 to 10 and 12 to 17 are pending in this application of which only claim 17 is in independent form.

The applicants' attorney expresses his thanks to the Examiner for her careful comments in the advisory action and has cancelled claim 1 and substituted claim 17 therefor in view of these comments.

Claim 1 had been rejected as being anticipated separately by Newman and Griswold. The following will show that claim 17 patentably distinguishes the invention over each of these references.

In claim 17, the guide member is defined as having:

    "...a helically-shaped guide slot  
    wherein turns of said coil spring are  
    guided;

    said end section and said transition  
    section being guided in said guide slot;"

Thus, the guide slot is now defined as a helically-shaped guide slot wherein the turns of the coil spring are guided. The end section of the coil spring as well as the transition section thereof are guided in the helically-shaped guide slot. The above features make clear that the coil spring is mounted in the helically-shaped guide slot with respect to its end section as well as with respect to its transition section.

This now makes clear that the tubular extension 36 of

Griswold cannot be viewed as a guide for the coil spring. In this tubular extension 36, there is no helically-shaped slot provided wherein the spring is guided with play with respect to a transition section thereof as now also more carefully set forth in claim 17 with the clauses:

    "said helically-shaped guide slot having a base and said transition section being guided in said guide slot with a first play (b) to said base measured in radial direction;

    said guide slot having first and second flanks delimiting said slot in the axial direction of said longitudinal axis; and,

    said transition section having a second play (c) to said first flank in said axial direction and a third play (d) to said second flank also in said axial direction with said plays (b, c, d) becoming overcome during said deformation under load so as to permit the turns of said transition section to lie at least in part against said guide slot thereby increasing the stiffness of said coil spring."

The above clauses of applicants' claim 17 describe also the function of the antivibration element in that the transition section of the coil spring is guided in the guide slot with a play (b) with respect to the base of the guide slot measured in radial direction. The antecedent basis in the applicants' disclosure for this play is given, for example, on page 1, line 28, and on page 6, line 10. In addition, the slot is defined as having flanks which delimit the guide slot in the direction of the longitudinal axis of the coil spring. In this way, it is clear that the guide slot defines limits via the

flanks in the axial direction at both sides of the turns of the coil spring. The transition section of the coil spring has a play (c) to the first flank and a play (d) to the second flank. This too is disclosed in the applicants' disclosure on page 6, lines 8 and 9. When the coil spring deforms under load, the play is overcome and the turns of the transition section of the coil spring lie, at least in part, against the guide slot so that the stiffness of the spring is increased. This is set forth in the applicants' disclosure on page 1, line 30, to page 2, line 4. Because the turns of the coil spring lie against the walls of the guide slot during deformation of the coil spring, the condition is obtained that the antivibration element has a low spring constant in the unloaded state which increases under load and the deformation associated therewith.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Griswold nor Newman provide any suggestion which could lead our person of ordinary skill to arrive at the particular configuration of the antivibration element as it is now set forth in claim 17.

Newman discloses a holder for a coil spring whose spring constant is constant over the entire range of deflection as described at column 2, lines 40 to 42, of this reference. This is achieved in that the slots, in which the coil spring is guided, has respective grooves (49, 51) introduced therein as shown in FIG. 3a of this reference. The grooves are intended to be so deep that a contact of the spring against the flank of the slot is still avoided during the largest possible compressive displacement of the spring from its relaxed length  $L$  as described at column 4, lines 6 to 10, of Newman. The number of active

turns remains constant during deflection of the spring (column 4, line 38).

As shown in FIG. 3a of Newman, the grooves (49, 51) therefore extend advantageously over only a turn of the coil spring so that the coil spring is either held tight in the axial direction or (in those sections wherein a groove is provided in the flank of the slot), on one side of the turn of the coil spring, no flank is provided and, on the opposite-lying side, a cutout is provided which prevents a contact of the coil spring against the flank of the slot. In this region, the coil spring is not guided in both directions.

In contrast to Newman, the applicants' invention provides that the coil spring, in its transition section, is arranged in a helically-shaped guide slot. The coil spring is guided axially in both directions with play to a flank of the guide slot. During compression, the coil spring lies against the one flank and, for a stretching of the coil spring, the coil turn lies against the other flank of the guide slot. In this way, it is ensured that for deformation in each direction, a contact of the coil spring against the slot can take place. In contrast to the applicants' invention, a contact of the coil spring against the guide slot is to be expressly avoided in Newman. Since there is no guidance of the coil spring in the transition section via flanks provided on both sides of the coil turn, it is not possible for Newman to render the applicants' invention obvious, let alone, anticipate the same.

In Griswold, there is no guidance in the form of a helically-shaped guide slot in the transition section as in the

applicants' invention. Accordingly, Griswold also shows no flanks of a slot in the transition section which are arranged on both sides of a turn of the coil spring.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that claim 17 should now patentably distinguish the applicants' invention over each of Griswold and Newman and be allowable.

The remaining claims 2 to 10 and 12 to 16 are all dependent from claim 17 so that these claims too should now be allowable.

Reconsideration of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Walter Ottesen". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Walter" and last name "Ottesen" clearly distinguishable.

Walter Ottesen  
Reg. No. 25,544

Walter Ottesen  
Patent Attorney  
P.O. Box 4026  
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20885-4026

Phone: (301) 869-8950

Date: March 14, 2005